

1

**Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated February 3, 2006 and is due on or before May 3, 2006.

With regard to the non-art objections and rejections applicant has made a good faith effort in correcting those matters identified by the Examiner. In regard to the rejections of Claims 11, 20 and 26 in paragraph 5 of the Office Action, Claim 20 has been cancelled. Claims 11 and 26 were rejected as no specific solder was identified in the claims. One such solder pliable (one that remains pliable in the temperature range) is a solder consisting of tin. Claims 11 and 16 have been appropriately modified. Further, the rejections identified in paragraph 7 of the Office Action have also been addressed.

Claims 16-19 and 21-23 were rejected as anticipated by Baihle USP 2561487. the Examiner is correct in that technology existed prior to the present invention that taught wire rope and wire cable (considered to be one in the same) could be dipped in material to protect same. Further, as evident by the applied prior art, pretensioners for use with seat belt buckles also predated the present invention. However, it is respectfully urged that the prior art does not teach the features of the present invention which utilizes a solder dipped or coated wire cable for the purpose of improving performance of a pretensioner (also known as a belt [seat belt] tightener).

Claims 1, 3-11 and 26 were rejected as obvious over Wier USP 5897140 in view of Riggs USP 3318082. Wier '140 teaches a plastics coating about a wire cable to affect a gas seal for his pretensioner. Riggs teaches how to impregnate a wire cable to protect the wire cable from dust and debris. The present invention includes a method of coating a wire cable with solder which binds to the metal/wire cable to increase the cable's resistance to bending which makes it more difficult, that is requires more energy to pull a coated portion of wire cable about a pulley or other curved surface compared to an uncoated portion of the wire cable.

Claims 2 and 13-15 were rejected as obvious over Wier '140, Riggs '080 and further in view of Wier USP 6095615 and Sachs USSR 2005/0017567. The use of a sleeve such as taught by Wier '615 is similar to that shown in Figure 4 (prior art) of the

present invention. By dipping the wire cable in solder eliminates the need to place such a sleeve about the cable and provides a new and novel approach to pretensioning (and one that achieves a cost savings). It is not clear what Sachs teaches apart from coating a seat belt with plastic or the like which is not felt to be applicable to the present invention.

In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully urged that the present application be reconsidered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Markell Seitzman  
Reg. No. 28,756

(586) 726-3905  
(586) 726-4172 (fax)